

Serial No. 08/807,322
Art Unit 2744

obtained image information.

50. The circuit ~~card~~ of claim 49, further comprising means for performing a character recognition task on an image obtained by the camera card for generating a set of recognized characters.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4 - 9, 11 - 16, 18, 19, 24, and 28 have been amended and claims 33 - 50 have been added.

Claims 1 and 4 - 50 are in the case.

Claims 29 - 32 stand allowed and the subject matter of claims 6 and 24 has been deemed allowable.

REJECTIONS:

Claims 1, 4, 7-23, 25, 26, and 28 were again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious and unpatentable over the reference PARULSKI ET AL (WO 94/14274) in view of the reference VIRTUOSO ET AL (U.S. 5,594,952), on the grounds that while PARULSKI discloses a device (fig. 2a), for data processing (p.9, lines 10-27), which is a small-sized portable and hand-held work station comprising: a data processing unit (LUT 62); a display (fig. 1a, item 11); a user interface (i.e., keyboard, fig. 2a); at least one memory unit (p.12, lines 20-26), a power source (inherent); and application software (p.9, lines 10-15), the device also has a camera unit (fig.2a, item 30) which includes a camera and optics (fig. 2a), and at least one memory unit (p.9, lines 12) wherein "at least a portion of the camera is located within the housing of the device (fig.2a, item 28)" and "a portion of the camera is integrated in a circuit card (PCMCIA card) that is electrically coupled to the card slot of the device (fig. 2a)", it fails to disclose means for transmitting image information processed by the data processing unit. However, it was contended that VIRTUOSO discloses a device for integration between voice and data radio communication having

Serial No. 08/807,322
Art Unit 2744

a computer for connecting a PCMCIA card which has an RF section for transmitting and receiving data and voice information to another location using a radio frequency channel so that it would be obvious to modify PARULSKI's PCMCIA card to include an RF section as taught by VIRTUOSO in order to transmit and receive data and voice information.

Claim 27 was separately rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious and unpatentable over the reference PARULSKI ET AL (WO 94/14274) in view of the reference VIRTUOSO ET AL (U.S. 5,594,952), and further in view of the reference SIMPSON ET AL for disclosing the use of Short Message Service lacking in the other two references.

Claims 1, 4-26, and 28 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious and unpatentable over the reference PAAJANEN ET AL in view of the PARULSKI ET AL (WO 94/14274) reference, on the grounds that PAAJANEN discloses a portable personal computer and mobile telephone device integrated into one and the same body structure, which body contains all of the features defined in these claims except for a PCMCIA card having a camera portion into a computer for taking a picture and processing image information, but PARULSKI evidences that this is known so that the combination would be obvious.

Claim 27 was also separately rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious and unpatentable over the reference PAAJANEN ET AL in view of the reference VIRTUOSO ET AL (U.S. 5,594,952), and further in view of the reference SIMPSON ET AL for disclosing the use of Short Message Service lacking in the other two references.

Claims 29 - 32 were allowed and the subject matter of claims 6 and 24 was recognized as being allowable and it was indicated that theses claims would be allowed if rewritten in independent form.

In response to the Applicants' arguments filed 2/5/99, the Examiner noted that the limitations regarding incorporating into a PCMCIA card that are stated on page 6, lines 22 and 23, and those regarding an infrared link at page 14, lines 12-18, and converting images generally at pps. 8 and 9, etc., all were not explicitly

F

Serial No. 08/807,322
Art Unit 2744

recited in the pertinent claims.

REPLY:


Firstly, claims 6 and 24 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of their respective parent claims 1 and 19 and put them in independent form and are therefore now in allowable form.

Next, Applicants have added claims 33 - 50 to specifically meet the Examiner's contentions in his response that the limitations mentioned in Applicants' arguments in their previous response were not explicitly set forth in the pertinent claims. Accordingly, regarding the Examiner's contention that "the limitations, as is stated on page 6, lines 22 and 23, are not recited in the rejected claim(s)", it will be seen that added claim 33 is directed to an embodiment of the device defined in claim 1 in which the camera is on a PCMCIA or other type of card that is attached to the device and thus the various parts of the camera are integrated in the card. Such a teaching is not found or suggested in PARULSKI, nor in VIRTUOSO since in the invention the transmission part is within the device itself, not within the card. Claim 37 defines a device similar to that of claim 33 but in this embodiment the device includes a cellular mobile phone part.

Claim 41 defines a device similar to that of claim 1 but in this embodiment the device is defined to be a "device for personal communication" wherein the camera is an internal camera, i.e., a built in camera. Such a teaching is not found in any of the prior art references cited.

Claims 33 and 41 do not specifically define the radio communication mechanism, which can be a cellular mobile phone part, or another type or radio link, such as the present WLAN and Bluetooth technologies, which are possibly applicable in this embodiment.

Claim 45 defines a device similar to that of claim 9 but in this embodiment the device is defined to be a cellular mobile phone and the camera is internal, and Claim 49 defines a device similar to that of claim 8 but in this embodiment the components of the camera, i.e., the various parts, are integrated within the card. The defined features of these embodiments are not taught by




Serial No. 08/807,322
Art Unit 2744

PARULSKI wherein the card part merely comprises a connector.

Consequently, for the reasons as precedingly explained, it is submitted that added claims 33 - 50 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art, and thus should be allowed along with claims 6, 24, and 29 - 32, as well as the remaining claims 1, 4, 5, 7 - 23, 25 - 28 as will now be explained.

Regarding the teaching of the PARULSKI reference and its relation to the remaining claims, it is asserted that the camera unit 20 of PARULSKI is entirely separate from the work station part 10 of the device, as PARULSKI clearly discloses at Page 6, lines 17 - 20, wherein it is noted that the extender board 24, that is used to connect the camera 20 to the computer 10, is removable from the camera 20. Thus, the camera 20 is not inserted in the receptacle 12 or slot 16 in the workstation computer 10, but rather a connector card or extender board 24, which is separate from the camera 20 and computer 10 and acts as an interface to connect the two, is the unit insertable in the slot 16. Consequently, there is no suggestion in PARULSKI that electronic components of the camera circuit are distributed between the workstation and the camera unit, or, as contended by the Examiner, that the camera unit is actually integrated into a PCMCIA card. Accordingly, PARULSKI fails to teach the claimed limitation in independent claims 1, 8, 9, 15, 19, and 28, of the camera unit being in some incorporated relationship with the device with which it cooperates. It is therefore submitted that PARULSKI's teaching, which was used in combination with other references to reject these claims, cannot support the reasoning used for the combining of the various teachings in those rejections and hence all of the contended grounds for rejection are invalid in rejecting these claims on obviousness.

All of the claims in the application being in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth in detail above, it is earnestly solicited that all of the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, the claims be allowed, and the application be passed to issue. However, should there be any remaining issue that would impede the allowance of all of the pending claims, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at any of the





Serial No. 08/807,322
Art Unit 2744

numbers appearing below.

As the number of independent claims resulting from the entry of this amendment is increased by 7 and the total number of claims is increased by 18 an additional fee of $(7 \times \$78 = \$546 + 18 \times \$18 = \$324)$ \$ 870.00 is due.

A three-month extension of time to respond is hereby petitioned and the fee of \$870.00 therefor is included in the enclosed check in the amount of $(\$ 870.00 + \$870.00)$ \$1740.00 to cover the total of the fees due.

The Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 16-1350 for any further fee that may be required to maintain the pendency of this patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas P. Dowd

Thomas P. Dowd
Reg. No.: 24,586

July 26, 2000
Date

RECEIVED
AUG 11 2000
TO 2700 MAIL ROOM

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT. 06430

Telephone: (203) 259-1800
Facsimile: (203) 255-5170

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231.

Deanne Murphy
Name of Person Making Deposit

7/27/00
Date

F